



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/879,117	06/13/2001	Johan Wanselin	003300-794	3882
7590	10/07/2008		EXAMINER	
Benton S. Duffett, Jr.			CHORBALI, MONZER R	
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.				
P.O. Box 1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/879,117	WANSELIN ET AL.
	Examiner MONZER R. CHORBAJI	Art Unit 1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 05 October 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/30/07

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This non-final action is in response to the RCE filed on 9/2/08

Claim Objections

1. The numbering of claims is not in accordance with 37 CFR 1.126 which requires the original numbering of the claims to be preserved throughout the prosecution. When claims are canceled, the remaining claims must not be renumbered. When new claims are presented, they must be numbered consecutively beginning with the number next following the highest numbered claims previously presented (whether entered or not). There are 2 claims number 22. Misnumbered claims 22-26 have been renumbered as 22-27.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1, 11-15, and 20-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huston et al (U.S.P.N. 3,407,027) in view of Houston et al (U.S.P.N. 5,894,014) and further in view of Hennebert et al (U.S.P.N. 4,764,351).

Regarding claim 1, Huston discloses a sterilization chamber (figure 1:14) within an autoclave device (figure 1:10) that includes the following: a housing (figure 1:12, 15, and 17); pressure means (pressurized steam within chamber 14); chamber is capable of enclosing goods to be sterilized during a sterilization process; wherein the sterilization chamber comprises weld portions (27) formed in integration with the rest of the chamber (14, 29, and 27) that is capable of allowing (welds 14, 29, and 27 can be broken thereby separating the different components of the housing including chamber 14; or the different components of the housing including chamber 14 can be connected back together by welding the components) the releasable connection (27, 22, and 29) of the sterilization chamber (14) directly to the housing (12, 15, and 17) of the autoclave device (10) by means of repeatedly removable welds (22, 23, 29, and 27). Huston

teaches that the inner shell (14) is to be manufactured from corrosion resistant material (col.1, lines 48-52), but fails to teach the type of building material. Yet it is known in the art to form chambers from either stainless steel or plastics. In addition, Huston fails to teach the following: the presence of steam inlet within the wall of the chamber that is necessary for inputting steam into the chamber; the use of fastening portions; and the use of display means in the autoclave device.

Houston discloses a steam chamber (figure 1:12) that is fastened to the sterilization device (figure 1:10) with fastening portions (the unlabeled screws in figure 1 are considered the fastening portions for connecting upper frame element 28 and chamber 12 to the sterilization device 10) that are formed in integration with the rest of the chamber (the unlabeled screws in figure 1 connect with chamber 12), because such a sterilization device provides the requisite, safety, installation flexibility, and low cost (col.1, lines 41-43). In addition, Houston discloses an integral steam inlet within the wall of the chamber (figure 1:16) for releasable connection to a sterilant source (col.2, lines 51-52) so that the sterilization device is suited to small laboratories, emergency care facilities, as well as doctors and dentist offices (col.1, lines 12-14) and the use of display means (figure 7:70) in the autoclave device that results in low cost, low complexity of assembly and improved serviceability (col.3, lines 46-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the sterilization chamber in Huston with the fastening screws in order to provide a sterilization device having the requisite, safety, installation flexibility, and low cost as described by Houston (col.1, lines 41-43).

Houston fails to teach the type of chamber building material. Hennebert sterilizes items in a sterilization chamber (figure 2:1) that is constructed of plastic material (col.5, lines 17-27, col.6, lines 53-55 and col.9, lines 10-16) since plastic is low in cost and does not conduct electricity (col.5, lines 23-25 and col.6, lines 53-54). As to the added limitation that "the polymeric chamber has natural heat isolating properties so as to reduce the risk of burning to a person touching the housing of the autoclave device", Hennebert's chamber is capable of having heat isolating properties so that persons touching it do not burn their hands. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the modified chamber in Huston/Houston with the polymeric material since plastic is low in cost and does not conduct electricity as taught by Hennebert (col.5, lines 23-25 and col.6, lines 53-54).

Regarding claim 22, Huston discloses a sterilization device (figure 1:10) for sterilizing goods to be sterilized, comprising: a housing (figure 1:12, 15, and 17) constituting an outer boundary of the sterilization device (outer shell 12 constitute an outer boundary of device 10); a sterilization chamber (figure 1:14) that is capable of enclosing the goods to be sterilized, and being arranged within the housing (10); and the sterilization chamber comprising weld portions (27) formed in integration with the rest of the chamber (14, 29, and 27) where the weld portions are capable of being repeatedly removable (welds 14, 29, and 27 can be broken thereby separating the different components of the housing including chamber 14; or the different components of the housing including chamber 14 can be connected back together by welding the components). Huston teaches that the inner shell (14) is to be manufactured from

corrosion resistant material (col.1, lines 48-52), but fails to teach the type of building material. Yet it is known in the art to form chambers from either stainless steel or plastics. In addition, Huston fails to teach the use of removable fastener means and the use of fastening portions.

Houston discloses a steam chamber (figure 1:12) that is fastened to the sterilization device (figure 1:10) with removable fastener means (the phrase "means for" is considered to invoke 112, paragraph 6 and is considered equivalent to the unlabeled screws in figure 1 for releasably connecting upper frame element 28 and chamber 12 to the sterilization device 10 where one of ordinary skill in the art would realize that corresponding bores are present in both the chamber and the upper frame element where the bores that are present in the chamber are considered the fastening portions) for releasably fastening the fastening portions (unlabeled bores in chamber 12) of the sterilization chamber, and thereby the sterilization chamber, in the housing, because such a sterilization device provides the requisite, safety, installation flexibility, and low cost (col.1, lines 41-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the sterilization chamber in Huston with the fastener screws in order to provide a sterilization device having the requisite, safety, installation flexibility, and low cost as described by Houston (col.1, lines 41-43).

Houston fails to teach the use of polymeric material as the chamber building material. Hennebert sterilizes items in a sterilization chamber (figure 2:1) that is constructed of plastic material (col.5, lines 17-27, col.6, lines 53-55 and col.9, lines 10-16) since plastic is low in cost and does not conduct electricity (col.5, lines 23-25 and

col.6, lines 53-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the modified chamber in Huston/Houston with the polymeric material since plastic is low in cost and does not conduct electricity as taught by Hennebert (col.5, lines 23-25 and col.6, lines 53-54).

Regarding claim 25, Huston discloses a sterilization chamber (figure 1:14) for use in an autoclave device (10) including a housing (12, 15, and 17); pressure means (pressurized steam within chamber 14); the sterilization chamber (14) comprising: a front planar wall surface (unlabeled planar front wall surface of chamber 14 in figure 2) including a front opening for allowing access to the chamber; a rear planar wall surface (unlabeled planar rear wall surface of chamber 14 adjacent to housing 17 in figure 1); and a chamber body portion disposed therebetween where the sterilization chamber (14) is capable of enclosing goods to be sterilized during a sterilization process; the sterilization chamber comprises weld means (27, 22, 23, and 29) that are capable of releasably mounting (welds 14, 29, and 27 can be broken thereby separating the different components of the housing including chamber 14; or the different components of the housing including chamber 14 can be connected back together by welding the components) the chamber (14) in the sterilization device (10); the releasable weld means (22, 27, 29, 23, and 27) releasably connecting the front wall surface (unlabeled planar front wall surface of chamber 14 in figure 2) and the rear wall surface (unlabeled planar rear wall surface of chamber 14 adjacent to housing 17 in figure 1) directly to the housing (12, 15, and 17) of the device (10). Huston teaches that the inner shell (14) is to be manufactured from corrosion resistant material (col.1, lines 48-52), but fails to teach

the type of building material. Yet it is known in the art to form chambers from either stainless steel or plastics. In addition, Huston fails to teach the following: the presence of steam inlet within the wall of the chamber that is necessary for inputting steam into the chamber; the use of releasable fastener means; and the use of display means in the autoclave device.

Houston discloses a steam chamber (figure 1:12) that is fastened to the sterilization device (figure 1:10) with releasable fastener means (the phrase "means for" is considered to invoke 112, paragraph 6 and is considered equivalent to the unlabeled screws in figure 1 that are capable of repeatedly and releasably mounting chamber 12 in device 10 by connecting upper frame element 28 and chamber 12 to the sterilization device 10), because such a sterilization device provides the requisite, safety, installation flexibility, and low cost (col.1, lines 41-43). In addition, Houston discloses an integral steam inlet within the wall of the chamber (figure 1:16) for releasable connection to a sterilant source (col.2, lines 51-52) so that the sterilization device is suited to small laboratories, emergency care facilities, as well as doctors and dentist offices (col.1, lines 12-14) and the use of display means (figure 7:70) in the autoclave device that results in low cost, low complexity of assembly and improved serviceability (col.3, lines 46-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the sterilization chamber in Huston with the fastening screws in order to provide a sterilization device having the requisite, safety, installation flexibility, and low cost as described by Houston (col.1, lines 41-43).

Houston fails to teach the type of chamber building material. Hennebert sterilizes items in a sterilization chamber (figure 2:1) that is constructed of plastic material (col.5, lines 17-27, col.6, lines 53-55 and col.9, lines 10-16) since plastic is low in cost and does not conduct electricity (col.5, lines 23-25 and col.6, lines 53-54). As to the added limitation that "the polymeric chamber has natural heat isolating properties so as to reduce the risk of burning to a person touching the housing of the autoclave device", Hennebert's chamber is capable of having heat isolating properties so that persons touching it do not burn their hands. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the modified chamber in Huston/Houston with the polymeric material since plastic is low in cost and does not conduct electricity as taught by Hennebert (col.5, lines 23-25 and col.6, lines 53-54).

Regarding claims 11-12 and 14-15, Huston teaches the following: a chamber that is capable of being releasably fastened within the autoclave device (figure 1:14, 28 and figure 2:14, 27, 23), chamber is essentially manufactured in one continuous piece (figure 1:14), chamber is sealed by a movable sealing door (figure 2:11) and a sterilization cycle (autoclaving) is to be performed in the sterilization device (figure 1:10).

Regarding claim 13, Huston fails to explicitly recite the presence of steam inlet within the wall of the chamber that is necessary for inputting steam into the chamber. Hennebert teaches an integral steam inlet within the wall of the chamber (figure 1:1,17 and unlabeled integral opening in chamber for inputting steam). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to further add an integral opening into the wall of Huston chamber as taught by Hennebert (figure 1:1, 17) so that steam is directly added into the space of chamber resulting in faster increasing pressure and temperature within the chamber.

Regarding claim 20, Huston fails to teach a chamber having a pair of integrally formed tracks in which the sealing chamber door may be slidably mounted. Houston teaches that the chamber door is slidably mounted (col.2, lines 61-64) and that the chamber door is provided with a pair of integrally formed tracks (figure 2:44) such that the tracks and the chamber are capable of being removed simultaneously so that a sterilization device, which provides the requisite, safety, installation flexibility and low cost is obtained (col.1, lines 41-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute Huston chamber door with a slidably mountable chamber door with a pair of formed tracks so that a sterilization device, which provides the requisite, safety, installation flexibility and low cost is obtained as taught by Huston (col.1, lines 41-43).

Regarding claim 21-22, Huston discloses front and back surfaces that are flat (a front flat wall surface is considered the unlabeled flat front wall surface of chamber 14 in figure 2 and a rear flat wall surface is considered the unlabeled flat rear wall surface of chamber 14 adjacent to housing 17 in figure 1). Huston fails to teach the use of flat fastening portions and also fails to teach the use of fastening means. Houston discloses a steam chamber (figure 1:12) that is fastened to the sterilization device (figure 1:10) with removable fastener means (the unlabeled screws in figure 1 are considered the fastening means for releasably connecting upper frame element 28 and chamber 12 to

the sterilization device 10 where one of ordinary skill in the art would realize that the corresponding bores are present in both the chamber and the upper frame element where the bores in the chamber wall are the flat surfaces of the side walls of chamber 12 are considered as the flat fastening portions), because such a sterilization device provides the requisite, safety, installation flexibility, and low cost (col.1, lines 41-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the sterilization chamber in Huston with the fastener screws in order to provide a sterilization device having the requisite, safety, installation flexibility, and low cost as described by Houston (col.1, lines 41-43).

Regarding claim 24, Huston fails to teach the use of fastener means. Huston discloses a steam chamber (figure 1:12) that is fastened to the sterilization device (figure 1:10) with removable fastener means (the unlabeled screws in figure 1 are considered the fastening means that are capable of repeated fastening, release, and subsequent fastening of the sterilization chamber 12 to the upper frame element 28, which is part of device 10), because such a sterilization device provides the requisite, safety, installation flexibility, and low cost (col.1, lines 41-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the sterilization chamber in Huston with the fastener screws in order to provide a sterilization device having the requisite, safety, installation flexibility, and low cost as described by Houston (col.1, lines 41-43).

Regarding claim 26, Huston discloses front and back surfaces that are planar

(a front planar wall surface is considered the unlabeled planar front wall surface of chamber 14 in figure 2 and a rear planar wall surface is considered the unlabeled planar rear wall surface of chamber 14 adjacent to housing 17 in figure 1). Huston fails to teach the use of fastener portions and also fails to teach the use of fastening elements.

Houston discloses a steam chamber (figure 1:12) that is fastened to the sterilization device (figure 1:10) with removable fastener elements (the unlabeled screws in figure 1 are considered the fastening elements for releasably connecting upper frame element 28 and chamber 12 to the sterilization device 10 where one of ordinary skill in the art would realize that the corresponding bores are present in both the chamber and the upper frame element where the bores in the chamber wall are the flat surfaces of the side walls of chamber 12 are considered as the fastener portions. In addition, the fastening elements are capable of being in a first position for fastening the sterilization chamber 12 within the device 10 and are also capable of being in a second position for removing the sterilization chamber 12 from the device 10 where the fastening elements are further capable of repeated fastening, release, and subsequent fastening of the sterilization chamber 12 to the upper frame element 28, which is part of device 10), because such a sterilization device provides the requisite, safety, installation flexibility, and low cost (col.1, lines 41-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the sterilization chamber in Huston with the fastener screws in order to provide a sterilization device having the requisite, safety, installation flexibility, and low cost as described by Houston (col.1, lines 41-43).

Regarding claim 27, Huston discloses that the chamber body portion (14) defines a cylindrical chamber area (unlabeled volume within chamber 14) for sterilization.

6. Claims 2, 5-6 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huston et al (U.S.P.N. 3,407,027) in view of Houston et al (U.S.P.N. 5,894,014) and Hennebert et al (U.S.P.N. 4,764,351) as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Spence (U.S.P.N. 4,919,888)

Regarding claims 2 and 5-6, Huston, Houston, and Hennebert fail to teach the following: chamber is manufactured from an injection-mouldable material, injection-mouldable material essentially is a polyamide material, and the chamber is manufactured from a composite material. Spence discloses a sterilization sealable container to be placed within an autoclave and further teaches the following: chamber is manufactured from an injection-mouldable material (col.4, lines 36-37 and line 31), injection-mouldable material essentially is a polyamide material (col.4, lines 36-37 and line 31) and the chamber is manufactured from a composite material (col.4, line 31), since such materials are not adversely affected by the sterilant or by the sterilization conditions (col.4, lines 30-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute construction material of the modified chamber in Huston/Houston/Hennebert with polymeric material, since such materials are not adversely affected by the sterilant or by the sterilization conditions as explained by Spence (col.4, lines 30-33).

Regarding claim 19, Huston discloses a chamber (figure 1:14) that is capable of being releasably mounted and fastened within the autoclave device (figure 1:14, 28 and figure 2:14, 27, 23).

7. Claims 3-4, 7-9 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huston et al (U.S.P.N. 3,407,027) in view of Houston et al (U.S.P.N. 5,894,014), Hennebert et al (U.S.P.N. 4,764,351), and Spence (U.S.P.N. 4,919,888) as applied to claims 2 and 6 and further in view of Quehl (U.S.P.N. 4,165,404).

Regarding claims 3-4, 7, and 9, Huston, Houston, Hennebert, and Spence fail to teach the following: the use of a reinforcement material such as rowing weave, the use of carbon fiber, a concatenating polymer material such as an epoxy material, and the use of a glass fiber rowing weave. Quehl teaches designing cast structures for various purposes including a dished head for a chemical process vessel (col.7, lines 48-50) and further discloses the following: the use of a reinforcement material such as rowing weave (col.2, lines 11-14 and line 45) arranged around the injection mouldable material (col.7, lines 24-27 and lines 48-50); the use of carbon fiber (col.2, line 44) and a concatenating polymer material such as an epoxy material (col.6, lines 10-12); and the use of glass fiber (col.2, line 44) and a concatenating polymer material (col.6, lines 10-12), because such material has desirable physical properties (col.2, lines 47-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the modified constituting chamber material in Huston/Houston/Hennebert/Spence with the glass or carbon fibers, because of their desirable physical properties as described by Quehl (col.2, lines 47-48).

Regarding claims 8 and 16-18, Huston, Houston, Hennebert, and Spence fail to teach the following: the use of a reinforcement material such as rowing weave, the use of carbon fiber and a concatenating polymer material such as an epoxy material. Quehl teaches designing cast structures for various purposes including a dished head for a chemical process vessel (col.7, lines 48-50) and further discloses the following: the use of a reinforcement material such as rowing weave (col.2, lines 11-14 and line 45) arranged around the injection mouldable material (col.7, lines 24-27 and lines 48-50); the use of carbon fiber (col.2, line 44) and a concatenating polymer material such as an epoxy material (col.6, lines 10-12); and the use of glass fiber (col.2, line 44) and a concatenating polymer material (col.6, lines 10-12), because such material has desirable physical properties (col.2, lines 47-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the modified constituting chamber material in Huston/Houston/Hennebert/Spence with the glass or carbon fibers, because of their desirable physical properties as described by Quehl (col.2, lines 47-48).

8. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huston et al (U.S.P.N. 3,407,027) in view of Houston et al (U.S.P.N. 5,894,014), Hennebert et al (U.S.P.N. 4,764,351), Spence (U.S.P.N. 4,919,888), and Quehl (U.S.P.N. 4,165,404) as applied to claim 9 and further in view of Leimbacher et al (U.S.P.N. 5,837,181).

Huston, Houston, Hennebert, Spence, and Quehl fail to teach the use of specific types of concatenating polymers as recited in the claim. Limbacher discloses designing

various structures that incorporate polyvinyl alcohol fibers (col.5, lines 25-26) since such fibers are known to have a high modulus (col.5, lines 25-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the modified constituting chamber material in Huston/Houston/Hennebert/Spence/Quehl with the polyvinyl alcohol since such fibers are known to have a high modulus as taught by Leimbacher (col.5, lines 25-26).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments see pages 10-11 of the Remarks section, filed on 9/2/08, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-20 under obviousness over Huston in view of Hennebert have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Houston et al as shown above.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MONZER R. CHORBAJI whose telephone number is (571)272-1271. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

11. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on (571) 272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

12. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. R. C./

/Jill Warden/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797